23.f.15.

Please return this book

to

The Librarian

St. Thomas's Hospital

Medical School

London

S.E.1.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL
15 JAN 1960
MEDICAL SCHOOL LIBRARY

KING'S College LONDON

TOMAS AC106 MUR(H)

Library
MURCHISON CHARLES
CORRESPONDENCE
1863

201241962 8
KINGS COLLEGE LONDON

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/b2130919x

205/18

CORRESPONDENCE

AND

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

ON THE POINTS AT ISSUE BETWEEN

DR. TWEEDIE & DR. MURCHISON

CONCERNING

IDENTICAL PASSAGES IN THEIR RESPECTIVE WORKS

ON FEVER.

FEBRUARY 1863.

"It is hard to overcome the evidence of dates and printed documents. This is all against Dr. Tweedie. Dr. Murchison has the most distinct priority throughout. . . . . It makes a bad cause worse that Dr. Tweedie should wind up a wholly insufficient justification by imputing to his opponent unworthy motives for making statements palpably true—statements which he has not refuted, and which his own referee, Dr. A. P. Stewart, had previously stamped with his approbation as necessary and carefully considered."

Lancet, January 31st, 1863.

"We regret that this matter was not allowed to remain where Dr. Murchison left it in his preface. He there had fully and sufficiently vindicated his claim to his own property."

Medical Times and Gazette, January 3rd, 1863.

"Dr. Murchison has done no more than was necessary and justifiable for the preservation of his own reputation, in making the remarks which we have quoted from his preface."

British Medical Journal, December 20th, 1862.

"It is clear that Dr. Tweedie's recognition of his colleague's labours should have been more explicit."

Medical Circular, January 7th, 1863.

"The verdict of popular opinion has been in favour of the plaintiff (Dr. Murchison). . . . . As illustrating the injury arising from this plagiarism, Dr. Pickells, in his excellent report on the Cork Fever Hospital, read in February 1861, gives that credit to Dr. Tweedie, which unquestionably belongs to Dr. Murchison."

Dublin Medical Press, Jan. 14th, and Feb. 18th, 1863.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. Introductory Remarks - - - - - 4

II. Statement by Dr. Murchison submitted to the Censors' Board of the Royal College of Physicians - - - - 5

III. Letter from Dr. A. P. Stewart to Dr. Tweedie - - 11

IV. Review of Dr. Tweedie's and Dr. Murchison's works on Fever in the *British Medical Journal* - - - - 12

V. Letter from Dr. Tweedie to Editor of *British Medical Journal* - 16

VI. Reply from Dr. Murchison - - - - 19

VII. Notice in *Medical Times and Gazette*, giving Dr. Tweedie's version of the Case as on "the best authority" - - - 23

VIII. Reply from Dr. Murchison - - - - 24

IX. Editorial Remarks in *Medical Times and Gazette* - - 25

X. Editorial Remarks in *Lancet* - - - - 27

XI. Letter from Dr. Murchison to Editor of *Lancet* - - 29

XII. Dr. Murchison's First Letter to the Registrar of the College of Physicians - - - - - - 29

XIII. Letter from Dr. Murchison to Dr. Tweedie - - - 30

XIV. First Resolution of Censors' Board of College of Physicians - 31

XV. Dr. Murchison's Second Letter to Registrar of Royal College of Physicians - - - - - - 31

XVI. Dr. Murchison's Third Letter to Registrar of College of Physicians 32

XVII. Final Resolution of Censors' Board of Royal College of Physicians - - - - - - 33

XVIII. Leading Article in the *Lancet* - - - - 33

I.

Introductory Remarks.

The necessity of collecting the following correspondence and editorial comments, is imposed upon Dr. Murchison, by the circumstance that Dr. Tweedie has caused to be reprinted, and is privately circulating, a letter, originally published by him in the *British Medical Journal* for Dec. 27th, 1862, which contains the most unfounded assertions respecting Dr. Murchison. The assertions in the letter in question, met with a public and complete refutation at Dr. Murchison's hands, by an appeal to published facts, which Dr. Tweedie has shrunk from confronting. His only reply to Dr. Murchison's public refutation, is the private circulation of a reprint of his own original letter.

Dr. Tweedie's letter was written, in consequence of his having been accused of plagiarism from Dr. Murchison's writings. The charge, however, was not made by Dr. Murchison, but in a review of his and Dr. Tweedie's works on Fever. Although Dr. Murchison felt it nesessary to point out the identity between certain passages in Dr. Tweedie's Lectures, and his own (Dr. Murchison's) previously published essays, in order to protect himself from the possible imputation of having borrowed from Dr. Tweedie without acknowledgment, he stated at one place, that Dr. Tweedie had transcribed his woods *inadvertently*. If anything were wanting to prove the necessity for the remarks in Dr. Murchison's Preface, it is the unjustifiable position assumed by Dr. Tweedie in the controversy which followed.

II.

STATEMENT BY DR. MURCHISON SUBMITTED TO THE CENSORS' BOARD OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

The paragraph in the Preface to my work on Fevers, alluding to Dr. Tweedie, refers to two distinct matters, which must not be confounded.

1. The sentence referring to the first is as follows :—

"Many of the tables contained in the essay referred to, together with my remarks upon them, have been adopted by Dr. Tweedie, in his Lumleian lectures, published in the *Lancet* for 1860."

The essay in question was entitled, *Contributions to the Etiology of Continued Fever*, and was published in the forty-first volume of the *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions* (1858). The sentence in my preface simply states, that many of the tables and remarks in that essay *have been adopted* by Dr. Tweedie. In fact, no fewer than seventeen pages (pp. 19-27, and 198-205) of the reprint of Dr. Tweedie's lectures, containing the results of very elaborate statistical analyses, are derived from this source. The remark in my preface was necessary; for though Dr. Tweedie acknowledges (pp. 198 and 200) that he is indebted for his statistical facts to my "*published paper*," he has occasionally adopted my reasonings and views, in the *ipsissima verba* of my printed essay, in such a manner as to lead his readers to think, that my remarks were his own observations upon the facts collected by me. For example, the parallel columns appended below illustrate the use which has been made of my writings; they prove that Dr. Tweedie has been credited with having written a paragraph contained in my previously published essay; and they show that the very way in which he has introduced my name is calculated to disconnect me from the authorship of the passage. Still I did nothing more than state—that Dr. Tweedie had *adopted* my tables and remarks, and I did not in my preface, or in my part of my book, accuse him of plagiarism. On the contrary, when referring in the body of my work (p. 606), to the passage quoted below, I observed that Dr. Tweedie had transcribed my words *inadvertently:*

"Dr. Tweedie, in his lectures on fevers published in the *Lancet* for 1860, has inadvertently transcribed, *verbatim*, my remarks on this subject, without, in this instance, indicating their source; consequently, a recent writer has been misled to quote, as from that author, a paragraph, which appeared in my essay in 1858."

DR. MURCHISON.*

(*Medical and Chirurgical Transactions*, vol. xli, 290; communicated March 30, 1858.)

"To *all of* these results the Irish Hospitals present a marked antithesis. Out of 150,939 cases of fever admitted into the Dublin Fever Hospital since the year 1817, only 10,632, or less than 1 in 14, *have* died; and during the last eighteen years *it will be seen from the table that* the mortality has only been 1 in 13$\frac{2}{5}$. Again, in the Cork Fever Hospital, the mortality has been *even* much less. Since the year 1817, out of 82,293 patients only 3222, or 1 in 25½, have died; and during the eighteen years contained in the table the mortality has only been 4½ per cent., or 1 in 23¼. Moreover, the rate of mortality has varied much less in different years than *it does* in England and Scotland. Thus, in Dublin, in no year during tho last forty has it reached 10 per cent.; and in the Cork Hospital in only one year of the last forty has it slightly exceeded 6 per cent. *In the year* 1838, *Dr. Cowan, of Glasgow, drew attention to the striking discrepaney in the mortality from fever between the British and Irish Hospitals; and I find, on referring to* Barker and Cheyne's Report of the Irish Epidemic *of* 1817-19, that out of 100,737 patients in the Hospitals of all Ireland, 4349 died, making *a* mortality of 4·3 per cent., or *of* only 1 in 23$\frac{1}{6}$. No doubt *the circumstance, to which I have just ealled attention*, is partly accounted for by the greater facilities afforded to mild cases for entering the Hospitals in Ireland; but whether this be tho case or not, it plainly shows that there is a form of fever constantly *present* in Ireland, which is much milder, and the mortality *from* which is much less, *than is the case* with the fever *we more generally meet with* in this country."

DR. TWEEDIE.

(*Lancet*, May 19, 1860, p. 486; and "Lectures on Fevers" 1862, p. 202.)

"To these results the Irish Hospitals present a marked autithesis. Out of 150,939 cases of fever admitted into the Dublin Fever Hospital since the year 1817, only 10,632, or less than 1 in 14, died; and during the last eighteen years the mortality has been only 1 in 13$\frac{2}{5}$. Again, in the Cork Fever Hospital the mortality has been much less. Since the year 1817, out of 82,293 patients only 3222, or 1 in 25¼, have died; and during the eighteen years coutained in the table the mortality has only been 4½ per cent., or 1 in 23¼. Moreover, the rate of mortality has varied much less in different years than in England and Scotlaud. Thus, in Dublin, in no year during the last forty has it reached 10 per cent.; and in the Cork Hospital, in only one year of the last forty has it slightly exceeded 6 per cent. *In* Barker and Cheyne's Report of tho Irish Epidemic, 1817-19, *it is stated* that out of 100,737 patients in the Hospitals of all Ireland, 4349 died, making *the* mortality 4·3 per cent., or only 1 in 23$\frac{1}{6}$. No doubt, *as Dr. Murchison says, this small mortality* is partly accountod for by the greater facilities afforded to mild cases for entering the Hospitals in Ireland; but whether this ho the case or not, it plainly shows that there is a form of fever constantly *prevailing* in Ireland, which is much milder, and *in* which tho mortalily is *consequently* much less, *as compared with* the fovers *that prevail* in this country."

DR. PICKELLS.

(*Cork Fever Hospital Report for* 1860, read February 21, 1861.)

"To these results, the Irish Hospitals," Dr. Tweedie remarks, "present a marked antithesis. Out of 150,939 cases of fever admitted into the Dublin Fever Hospital since the year 1817, ouly 10,632, or less than 1 in 14, died; and during the last eighteen years the mortality has been only 1 in 13. Again, in the Cork Fever Hospital the mortality has been much less. Since the year 1817, out of 82,293 patieuts only 3222, or 1 in 25½, have died; and during the eighteen years contained in the table, the mortality has been only 4½ per ceut., or 1 in 23¼. Moreover, he rate of mortality has varied much less in different years than in Englaud and Scotland. Thus, in Dublin, in no year during the last forty has it reached 10 per cent.; aud in the Cork Hospital in only one year of the last forty has it slightly exceeded 6 per cent."

* Dr. Tweedie's version is a *verbatim* transcript from my Essay, with the exception of tho portions printed in italics, which he has omitted or altered. In consequence of one omission ho has obtained tho credit of pointing out a fact, which I showed to be due to Dr. Cowan of Glasgow.

11. The other reference to Dr. Tweedie in my preface is as follows:—

"Dr. Tweedie, being about to republish his lectures, I feel it due to myself further to state, that most of his facts and reasonings bearing on the question of the 'change of type' of continued fevers, will be found in a paper published by me in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August 1858. As Dr. Tweedie omits to mention my paper, I think it necessary to allude to the circumstance, lest it might appear that I had now borrowed some of my remarks from his lectures without acknowledgment."

The paper here referred to was written in reply to a celebrated essay on the same subject by Dr. Christison of Edinburgh; it had no connection with that published in the *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions;* and but few of the facts and reasonings contained in it were derived from the statistics of the London Fever Hospital. The *entire passage*, treating on the change of type of continued fevers, is reprinted below from Dr. Tweedie's lectures, with the corresponding passages in my previously published essay, in parallel columns. The comparison shows, that the reasoning, every one of the facts adduced in its support, and indeed, the identical figures and calculations derived from widely scattered data, which are contained in Dr. Tweedie's lectures, are to be found in my essay. Not only is every one of the facts quoted by Dr. Tweedie to be found in my essay, but every one of the facts in my essay is absorbed into Dr. Tweedie's lectures; not one is omitted. The comparison also shows, that if I had not noticed the circumstance, it might have appeared, that in my recent work I had borrowed my views on this subject from Dr. Tweedie without acknowledgment. Whether or not, Dr. Tweedie borrowed his remarks from my essay in the *Edinburgh Journal*, or from the separate copies which I presented to him, the resemblance between the passages, is sufficiently close to justify the notice in my preface.

Dr. Murchison.	Dr. Tweedie.
(Remarks on the changes which are supposed to have taken place in the type of Continued Fever.—*Edin. Med. Journ.*, August 1858.)	("Lectures on Fevers," *Lancet*, May 19th, 1860, p. 487. Reprinted Edition, 1862, pp. 215-17.)
"In comparing the mortality from continued fever, at different times and places, or for the purpose of judging of the merits of different plans of treatment, it is essential to take into account the form of fever which has prevailed."	"But I am strongly persuaded that, in regard to fevers, the true explanation will be found in the fact that, until very recently, little or no attention has been paid to the ever-varying differences in form which they assume—at one time typhus, at another enteric (or typhoid), or it may be relapsing fever—constituting the features of the prevailing epidemic. So that the question of the identity or non-identity of the several forms of continued fevers becomes of the greatest importance in relation to the change of type theory.
"It is not a legitimate argument in favour of a change in the constitutional type of fever, to contrast the mortality after bloodletting in the *relapsing* epidemic of 1817-20, with what would be the effects of bleeding in the *typhus* of the present day."	

Dr. Murchison.

Ono of the main argnments, if not the principal one, urged by Dr. Christison, in favour of a change in the type of fever is, that in tho epidemic of 1817-20, the practice of bleeding largely, so far from being injurious, as it would undoubtedly be in the fever which of late years has been most prevalent, was followed by the most favourable results. Thus he remarks, after speaking of drawing "a legitimate allowance of thirty ounces (of blood) in all:" "And let it be remembered that we did by no means slay our patients by such bloodthirstiness. On the contrary, the mortality from the whole forms of fever collectively in that epidemic, did not exceed 1 in 22 at any period, and was reduced to 1 in 30 as the epidemic spread, and the remedy became more and more familiar.—*Edin. Medical Journal*, Jan. 7, 1858, p. 587."

"It is well known, however, and acknowledged by Dr. Christison himself, that the fever which characterised this epidemic, was that which is now familiar to many members of the profession, under the designation of relapsing fever." "What I maintain is, that this relapsing fever, which seems only to occur in the epidemic form at lengthened intervals, has been at all times remarkable for its small mortality as compared with that of the ordinary typhus, and that when no bleeding has been resorted to, the mortality has been even smaller than under the heroic practice, which was resorted to in Edinburgh during the epidemic of 1817-20." "Several epidemics of relapsing fever have occurred subsequently to that of 1817-20; and although venesection has constituted little or no part of the treatment, the mortality has not exceeded, or has been considerably less than, that observed during the period just alluded to."

"Thus, in 1843, relapsing fever was again epidemic in Edinburgh, and was made the subject of a monograph by Dr. Rose Cormack (*Nat. History, Pathology and Treatment of the Epidemic Fever at present prevailing in Edinburgh and other Towns.* By John Rose Cormack, M.D. Edinburgh, 1843), and of a lengthened series of papers in the *Medical Gazette* by Dr. Wardell (*London Medical Gazette,*

Dr. Tweedie.

The great argument adduced by those who support the doctrine of "change of type" is, the favourable results in the Edinburgh epidemic of 1817-20 (which I had the opportunity of witnessing) of large indiscriminate bleedings, in diminishing the mortality. We are told, somewhat exultingly, that under the unnecessarily profuse phlebotomy, the mortality did not exceed 1 in 22 at any period of the disease, and was reduced so low as 1 in 30 as the epidemic spread.

This argument, however, loses much of its intended effect, when it is considered that by much the larger number of cases consisted of relapsing fever—a form the mortality of which has already been shown to be exceedingly small under opposite modes of treatment, and in which the death-rate has been even less when no blood was abstracted at all.

For example, in that of 1843, the history of which has been given by Dr. Cormack, the death-rate was 1 in 16; of the cases recorded by Dr. Wardell (1843-4), it was 1 in 20;

Dr. Murchison.

vols. xvxvii to xl.) Among the cases observed by Dr. Wardell, the mortality was only 1 iu 20; and among Dr. Cormack's cases, it was one 1 in 16½."

"And of 203 cases admitted into the Edinburgh Infirmary in the years 1848-49, only 8 cases, or 3.94 per cent died. (*Statistical Tables, Royal Infirmary*, Ninth Series, p. 15.)"

"Again, of 7804 cases of relapsing fever (classified as distinct from typhus), which were admitted into the Glasgow Royal Infirmary between the years 1843 and 1853 inclusive, only 405, or 5.2 per cent. died. (*Glasgow Medical Journal*, vol. ii, p. 161.)"

"From this table it would appear, that out of 441 cases of relapsing fever treated in the London Fever Hospital, during the last ten years, only 2½ per cent. have died, or about 1 in 40."

"Among other arguments in favour of bloodletting in the epidemic of 1817-20, it was urged that, in many cases, its practice was followed by the most sudden and marked improvement in the general symptoms. Dr. Welsh speaks of it as having 'cut short' the disease in many cases. Against this, however, it must be borne in mind, that a very sudden improvement in the symptoms, constitutes a peculiarity of relapsing fever, totally independent of venesection. Dr. Cormack, speaking of the effects of bleeding in the relapsing fever of 1843, remarks:—'These beneficial changes were often not effects, though sequences of the bleeding, as was satisfactorily proved by the very same changes frequently occurriug as suddenly and unequivocably in patients in the same wards, and affected in the same way, who were subjected to no treatment whatever. (*Op. cit. p.* 151)."

"This observation has frequently been confirmed in the London Fever Hospital. Dr. Jenner, after mentioning a case of relapsing fever, which had been bled in this institution with no marked benefit, observes:—'Nature, unaided by the loss of blood, in many cases effected a much larger improvement in a much shorter space of time. (*Med. Times and Gazette*, new series, vol. ii, p. 31.)" "Out of 441 cases of rolapsing fevor, treated in the London Fever Hospital, during the last ten years, only 2½ per cent. have died, or about 1 in 40."

Dr. Tweedie.

and of 203 cases treated in the Edinburgh Infirmary in 1848-9, there were only 8 deaths;

and if we extend our enquiries to other places, we find, that of 7804 cases of relapsing fever admitted into the Glasgow Infirmary between the years 1843 and 1853, the mortality was 405, or about 5 per cent.;

and in the London Fever Hospital, of 441 cases, admitted during ten years (1848-1857), 11 died, being in the ratio of about 1 in 40.

This variation in the mortality could not be ascribed to the measures employed; for Dr. Cormack states that, having been urged by medical friends to test the effects of bloodletting, he instituted trials of this remedy, but candidly admitted that, though the symptoms were sometimes evidently relieved, the beneficial changes were often not effects but sequences of the bleeding, as was satisfactorily proved, by the very same changes frequently occurring, as suddenly and unequivocably, in patients in the same wards and affected in the same way, who were subjected to no treatment whatever.

And in regard to the measures instituted at the London Fever Hospital, when the mortality of relapsing fever did not exceed 1 in 40, with scarcely an exception, blood was not abstracted at any period of the disease.

Dr. Murchison.

"Consequently, it is not a legitimate argument in favour of a change in the constitutional type of fever, to contrast the mortality after bloodletting in the *relapsing* epidemic of 1817-20, with what would be the effects of bleeding in the *typhus* of the present day."

Dr. Tweedie.

It is evident, therefore, that the change of type theory cannot rest on comparison of the treatment by indiscriminate phlebotomy formerly practised, when all acute diseases, including fevers, were supposed to be under the dominion of the lancet."

The following example of the free use which has been made of my writings, is not alluded to in my work, but affords an additional illustration of the necessity for the remarks in my preface. In the reprint of Dr. Tweedie's lectures, published in October 1862, he professes to give in a note (pp. 26-27) his views concerning the prevalence of continued fevers since the delivery of his lectures at the College of Physicians. The note commences—"Since the present course of lectures was delivered, *I have ascertained*," &c. The greater portion of this note is appended below, and the parallel passages leave little doubt as to the unacknowledged sources, whence Dr. Tweedie derived his facts and reasonings.

Dr. Murchison.

(Report on Fever Hospital for the year 1861, read at Annual Meeting in February 1862, printed and circulated in April 1862; also a paper on "Prevalence of Continued Fevers," *Lancet*, April 2nd, 1859.)

"The number of typhus admissions, which, in 1856, amounted to 1062, in the year 1858 had diminished to 15, and in 1860 did not exceed 25. During seven months of 1858, only a single case of typhus, with the characteristic eruption on the skin, was admitted. But towards the close of the past year, typhus fever again became epidemic. * * * From that time it rapidly spread, so that in January 1862 the number of admissions for typhus almost equalled that at any period of the hospital's history, amounting to 140."

"During the twelve years, 1848 to 1859, inclusive, the number of admissions for typhoid fever into the London Fever Hospital, never exceeded 234, and was never less than 137, while the average for the entire twelve years was 181. This average was exactly maintained in the year 1858, in which only fifteen cases of typhus

Dr. Tweedie.

(*Lectures on Fevers*, published October 1862, p. 26.)

"If we trace back the records, we find that the number of typhus admissions, which, in 1856, amounted to 1062, in the year 1858 had diminished to 15, and in 1860 did not exceed 25. During seven months of 1858, only a single case of typhus, with the characteristic eruption on the skin, was admitted. But towards the end of last year (1861), typhus again became epidemic, and from that time has spread rapidly; so that in January of the present year (1862), the number of admissions for typhus almost equalled that at any period of the history of the hospital, amounting to 140."

"In the same years (1858, 1859, 1860), the enteric fever was the predominant disease. The average number of the last twelve years of this form was received into the hospital, the diminution in the total admissions having arisen from the comparative infrequency of typhus."

Dr. Murchison.	Dr. Tweedie.
were admitted." "It is the comparative absence of typhus of lato years that has accounted for the small number of admissions."	
"Relapsing fever resembles typhus in being essentially an epidemic disease. In 1851, the number of admissions for relapsing fever (256) exceeded that of any othor fever; but during the last seven years not a single case has been observed."	"Of relapsing fever, essentially an epidomic disease, not a single case has been observed during the last seven years."

III.—LETTER FROM DR. A. P. STEWART TO DR. TWEEDIE.

Shortly after the publication of Dr. Murchison's work, Dr. Tweedie, on Dec. 2nd, deputed a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians to see Dr. Murchison, in reference to the statements in his preface above quoted. Dr. Tweedie's own referee, after carefully investigating the whole of the documentary evidence, and hearing what Dr. Tweedie and Dr. Murchison had to state, wrote the following letter to Dr. Tweedie:—

74, *Grosvenor Street, W.* 8*th Dec.* 1862.

My dear Dr. Tweedie,

It is not forgetfulness of my promise that has caused my delay in communicating with you, on the subject of our conversation last Wednesday forenoon. I called that afternoon, as I intended, on Dr. Murchison, but found him from home. He, however, called on me in the evening, and both then and next morning, we entered fully into the subject. As he drew my attention to several important points, I thought it due to all parties to examino and compare at leisure the different passages to which reference was made.

Dr. Murchison lays much stress on the precise terms of his refcrence to the coincidences existing between his paper in the *Edinb. Monthly Journal* for August 1858, and your remarks in pages 215, 16, and 17, of your Lectures. It is only the alleged change of type in Continued Fevers, and not the goneral question of change of type in disease, that Dr. Murchison's paper professes to treat. Now he urgos that in that part of your lectures, which refers to the same subject, the difference between your remarks and his own is merely verbal. The arguments boing so nearly, and the figures so absolutely identical, it might naturally be supposed by those who had never seen or heard of his paper—more especially as you do not mention it—that he, being so much your junior, had borrowed from you. If, therefore, he felt conscious that he had been guilty of no such impropriety, the least he could do was simply to assert the fact, and to adduce his proviously published views, in support of his allegation.

But he has pointed out to me another fact, which is of even greater importance. You recollect my statement that a friend, to whom Dr. Murchison had shown the proof sheets of his work, had remarked that he seemed to have copied largely from you. It appoars that there oxisted printed evidence to prove that a similar impression might prevail in other quarters. Dr. Murchison has shown mo a Report of tho Cork Fever Hospital, in which a passage from your Lectures, as published in the *Lancet* (corresponding to pago 202 of your book), is quotod as yours, the passage in question being, with tho oxception of one word, an exact transcription of one in his Medico-Chirurgical Paper on the Etiology of Continued Fevers (vol. xli, pp. 290—291). Here, you soe, is a striking instance, notwithstanding

your general reference at page 200 to Dr. Murchison as your authority, o. crediting you with the authorship of a paragraph which belongs entirely to him. I think you will agree with me that if, in these circumstances, Dr. Murchison had kept silence, he would have laid himself open to serious misconstruction.

I cannot conclude without stating that the terms in which he has adverted to this matter have been the result on his part of long and careful consideration, and that his earnest wish and anxious endeavour was, to say nothing more than seemed to him absolutely necessary to guard himself against the suspicion of having acted improperly towards you. Need I assure you, that to myself personally it will be a source of much gratification, if these remarks shall in any way conduce to the amicable termination of this unhappy dispute between two of my much valued friends.

Believe me, my dear Dr. Tweedie,
Yours most truly,
(Signed) A. P. Stewart.

After the receipt of this letter, on December 13th, Dr. Tweedie had an interview with Dr. Stewart, at which he gave Dr. Stewart to understand, that he would follow his advice and let the matter drop. Whether he intended to do so or not, he took no public notice of the matter until December 27th, after the review of his own and Dr. Murchison's works had appeared in the "*British Medical Journal.*"

IV.

REVIEW IN THE "BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL," DEC. 20TH, 1862.

LECTURES ON THE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERS, PATHOLOGY, AND TREATMENT OF CONTINUED FEVERS, delivered at the Royal College of Physicians of London. By ALEXANDER TWEEDIE, M.D., F.R.S., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London; Consulting Physician to the London Fever Hospital, etc. Pp. 301. London: 1862.

A TREATISE ON THE CONTINUED FEVERS OF GREAT BRITAIN. By CHARLES MURCHISON, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians; Senior Physician to the London Fever Hospital, etc. Pp. 638. London: 1862.

THE revolution which has taken place during the last quarter of a century in the views of physicians as to the nomenclature and pathology of the continued fevers is an ample justification for the appearance of such treatises as those before us; and *primâ facie* they have the greater claim to be welcomed by the profession, inasmuch as they are both written by men who have had much experience in their subject. Of the authors, one, Dr. Murchison, has, we believe, studied fever almost entirely by the new light; while the other, Dr. Tweedie, brought up in the old school, has been led to modify considerably his former ideas, and to teach *ex cathedrâ* of the College of Physicians those doctrines of fever,

which modern study and experience have adopted as consonant with a correct reading of the facts presented.

It will be our task to examine the contents of each of these books; but first we must make some observations on a subject, the necessity for noticing which causes us regret, but on which justice imperatively demands from us an expression of opinion.

Towards the conclusion of his preface, Dr. Murchison makes the following remarks:—

"Many of the tables contained in the essay referred to" (one published by Dr. Murchison in the forty-first volume of the *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions*), "together with my remarks upon them, have been adopted by Dr. Tweedie in his Lumleian Lectures published in the *Lancet* for 1860. Dr. Tweedie being about to republish these Lectures, I feel it due to myself further to state, that most of his facts and reasonings bearing on the question of the 'change of type' of Continued Fevers, will be found in a paper published by me in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August 1858. As Dr. Tweedie omits to mention my paper, I think it necessary to allude to the circumstance, lest it might appear that I had now borrowed some of my remarks from his Lectures without acknowledgment."

These expressions of Dr. Murchison, involving as they do not only a defence of himself, but a charge of plagiarism against Dr. Tweedie, have caused us to examine into the correctness of the assertions; for, while we could scarcely think it credible that a man of Dr. Tweedie's position in the profession would be guilty of so grave a fault as that implied, it is a part of our duty to defend those who are aggrieved in the manner of which Dr. Murchison appears to complain. We will give, then, the result of our investigation.

At pages 19—28 of Dr. Tweedie's book, and also at pages 197 to 207, are a number of statistical details relating to fever, consisting of tables and commentaries thereon. The greater part of these are derived from the paper of Dr. Murchison, already referred to; and in some cases (as at page 202) not only are Dr. Murchison's tables used, but his deductions from them are copied almost, if not entirely, *verbatim*. Dr. Tweedie, indeed, in certain places, as at pages 19, 27, 198, and 200, acknowledges his obligations to Dr. Murchison for the statistics of which he has made use; but still the acknowledgment is not sufficiently explicit to show always plainly what has really been derived from Dr. Murchison. In some parts, indeed, the manner in which Dr. Murchison's name is introduced is calcuated to lead to a wrong impression, as to the shares which have been contributed by him and Dr. Tweedie respectively. Thus, at page 202, the whole of which consists of remarks on the mortality in the Irish fever hospitals, copied almost *verbatim* from Dr. Murchison's paper, Dr. Tweedie says:—

"No doubt, *as Dr. Murchison says*, this small mortality is partly accounted for by the greater facilities afforded to mild cases for entering the hospitals in Ireland; but whether this be the case or not, it plainly shows that there is a form of fever constantly prevailing in Ireland which is much milder, and in which, consequently, the mortality is much less, as compared with the fevers that prevail in this country."

Now, the introduction of the words which we have placed in italics would seem to show that the first clause of the sentence was a quotation of Dr. Murchison's opinion, while the concluding clause contained Dr. Tweedie's qualification of it; whereas, the fact is, that the whole sentence with some mere verbal alterations, is Dr. Murchison's own.

Dr. Tweedie has not, then, in our opinion, been sufficiently careful to point out what and how much, in regard to the statistics of fever, he has really derived from Dr. Murchison.

We come now to the matter to which Dr. Murchison specially refers—the appropriation by Dr. Tweedie of his remarks on the change of type in disease: and here we find that Dr. Murchison has stated no more than is absolutely correct and necessary for his own vindication. The facts collected by him, and a great part of the arguments derived from them (as given in a paper published in the *Edinburgh Monthly Journal* for August 1858), have been transferred by Dr. Tweedie to his lectures (pp. 214-217) without the least acknowledgment, and even in such a way as to lead to the impression that they are Dr. Tweedie's own. For, at page 214, Dr. Tweedie says, "Let me state the grounds upon which I have come to this conclusion"; and then, after about a page of original remarks, follows a mass of matter which is readily recognisable, on comparison, as Dr. Murchison's. In this case, then, Dr. Tweedie has, we must say, behaved in a very unfair manner towards Dr. Murchison, in a way, indeed, calculated to deprive the latter author of the credit due to him for the vast labour which he has bestowed on the subject of fever, especially in regard to its statistics.

That we are not exaggerating in our estimate of the effect of Dr. Tweedie's conduct, and that even his partial acknowledgment and occasional complimentary mention of Dr. Murchison are not sufficient to prevent mischief from being done, is fully proved in the report of the Cork Fever Hospital for 1860. In that document, at page 9, occurs the following quotation, derived from Dr. Tweedie's lectures, as published in the *Lancet*.

"To these results the Irish hospitals", Dr. Tweedie remarks, "present a marked antithesis. Out of 150,939 cases of fever admitted into the Dublin Fever Hospital since the year 1817, only 10,632, or less than 1 in 14, died; and, during the last eighteen years, the mortality has been only 1 in 13. Again, in the Cork Fever Hospital, the mortality has been much less. Since the year 1817, out of 82,293 patients, only 3,222, or 1 in 25¼, have died; and during the eighteen years contained in the table, the mortality has been only 4½ per cent., or 1 in 23¾. Moreover, the rate of mortality has varied much less in different years than in England and Scotland. Thus in Dublin, in no year during the last forty has it reached 10 per cent.; and in the Cork Hospital, in only one year of the last fifty has it slightly exceeded 6 per cent."

The whole of this quotation, attributed (no doubt without a knowledge of the facts) by the Cork physicians to Dr. Tweedie, was copied by him in his lectures and in his book—with the mere exception of omitting the words "all of" near the commencement

—*verbatim* from Dr. Murchison's paper in the *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions*.

It is unneeessary for us to dwell on this subject further. The observations we have already made will render it evident, not only that Dr. Murchison has done no more than was necessary and justifiable for the preservotion of his own reputation in making the remarks which we have quoted from his preface, but also that Dr. Tweedie has paid too little regard to the ordinary prineiples of justice, inasmuch as he has used the results of Dr. Murehison's labours in such a manner as to lead to the belief that they were his own thoughts and words—a result the more likely to oecur from the much greater length of time during which his name and professional and literary reputation have been before the profession, as compared with Dr. Murchison's.

Leaving this matter, which we regret to have been obliged to notice, we have to say now a word on Dr. Tweedie's book. It contains, after an introductory chapter, chapters on Enteric Fever, and on its Pathological Anatomy; on Typhus Fever; Relapsing or Recurrent Fever; Mortality of Continued Fevers; General Observations on the Treatment of Fevers; Treatment of Enterie Fever; Treatment of Typhus Fever; Sequelæ of Continued Fevers and their Treatment.

As has already been observed, Dr. Tweedie has found reason to change the views which he once held regarding the identity of typhus and typhoid or enteric fever, and under the influenee of which he wrote the article "Fever" in the *Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine;* and to adopt the modern doetrine that there are two forms of continued fever, having a general resemblance to each other, but distinguished from each other by the specifie lesions presented in each. The grounds on whieh he accepts the distinction are stated by him to be the differences in the symptoms and mode of access; in the duration of the symptoms; in the peculiarity of the eruption in eaeh; in the susceptibility to the two forms at certain periods of life; in their supposed causes; in the contagion of the two forms of fever; and in the results of treatment of the two forms. We shall have occasion to refer again to these topics in noticing Dr. Murchison's book, and therefore shall pass them over for the present, with the mere remark that eaeh of them receives able eomment from Dr. Tweedie.

Dr. Tweedie enters at some length on a eonsideration of the qucstion of the analogy between the eontinued and the eruptive fevers. His reasoning inelines him to an affirmative answer. "My own opinion is," he says, "that they have a strong resemblanee in many essential particulars." Typhus, he observes, presents an analogy to eruptive fevers in being eontagious; and to a certain extent he admits the same for enteric fever. Another point of analogy is the limitation of the disease to a single attack; seeond attaeks sometimes occur; but this, as Dr. Tweedie observes, is nothing more than what is known to take plaee in measles, scarlet fever, or small-pox. The next—and it may be considered the

great—point is the eruption, of which a specific form is presented in each kind of fever—the typhus and the enteric. On this point—the exanthematic nature of typhus—Dr. Murchison, we may state by anticipation, remarks, without apparently giving a positive opinion of his own, that the matter has been much debated; and that a place for typhus among exanthematous fevers has been claimed by Hildenbrand, Roupell, and Peebles. The evidence in favour of placing typhus at least among the eruptive fevers appears to us to be certainly very strong.

We must arrest at this point our notice of Dr. Tweedie's work; and it is scarcely necessary to examine it more fully, as the lectures of which it consists have already been laid before the profession in the pages of a contemporary. It may, however, be necessary to refer to them again in noticing the elaborate volume of Dr. Murchison. We therefore dismiss Dr. Tweedie for the present, with the remark that he has given a very readable and instructive account, for purposes of immediately practical importance, of the symptomatology, diagnosis, pathology, and treatment of the continued fevers of this country. We cannot but regret that, in the production of so able and useful a work, he should have allowed himself to be drawn into the commission of an error so grave as that on which we have found it necessary to offer remarks in the early portion of this article; but, with this exception, and with the caution necessarily arising therefrom to readers of the book to consider whose labours they are in certain parts really studying, we must give Dr. Tweedie his full share of credit for coming forward as a convert to and able exponent of those views which modern pathology and practice point to as being correct.

[*To be continued.*]

V.

LETTER FROM DR. TWEEDIE TO EDITOR OF "BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL," PUBLISHED DECEMBER 27TH, 1862, WITH REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

SIR,—The remarks of the reviewer of my *Lectures on Fevers*, in the last number of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, render an explanation on my part imperative; and I feel satisfied that, when I have made my statement, my medical brethren will not feel disposed to endorse the charge of plagiarism brought against me.

Let me state, then, in the first place, that six years ago, when I acceded to the request of the President to deliver a course of lectures at the College of Physicians on the Pathology of Fevers, I determined to avail myself of the ample store of facts recorded in the register of cases kept with great accuracy at the Fever Hospital. This, as one of the attending physicians, I had a right to do; but, in sketching for myself the statistical information I

should require, I perceived that the mechanical details would involve a much greater sacrifice of time and labour, than my other avocations, with the addition of the preparation of my lectures, would allow. In looking round for assistance in extracting the details from the hospital register, according to the plan I proposed, I mentioned incidently my dilemma to Dr. Murchison, who had been recently appointed junior assistant-physician to the hospital. He kindly offered his assistance, for which I felt grateful, as it allowed me to bestow more time on other parts of a subject so extensive as the pathology of fevers.

Although I should have been satisfied with a shorter average, he suggested that the inquiry should embrace the experience of the hospital for the preceding ten years; and I readily adopted the amended plan, pointing out to him the arrangement of the tables according to my ideas. After much delay, necessitated by the nature of the undertaking, the tables were produced, to which were appended such deductions as some of the details brought out. The manuscript was handed to me by Dr. Murchison, with the distinct understanding on his part that it was to be used for my lectures; and, accordingly, I had them transferred to canvas, and suspended in the theatre of the College for the purpose of illustrating my observations.

Soon afterwards, Dr. Murchison mentioned to me that he was preparing a paper for the Medico-Chirurgical Society, on the Etiology of Fevers, in which he intended to introduce these tables. This paper was read at the Society *two months at least after my first series of lectures was delivered;* so that I had no opportunity of doing more than to acknowledge to my audience my obligations to Dr. Murchison for the assistance he had rendered me in preparing the tables under my direction. I may also incidentally mention, that for much statistical matter he was indebted to me; for I communicated freely and unreservedly to him the information I received from my correspondence with leading provincial physicians in regard to recent prevalence of fevers, and their types as they had observed them. Dr. Murchison attended my lectures at the College, and I will not say that he profited by them; but, at all events, he became acquainted with my views, and practical experience.

My lectures were subsequently published in the *Lancet;* and, as I was on terms of friendship with him, I mentioned to him some months ago my intention to republish them. He then told me that, in alluding to the assistance I had received from him in the statistical details, I had stated that he had undertaken the tables "*at my suggestion*"—an expression which (though strictly accurate) had led some of his friends to think that he had received remuneration for the assistance he had voluntarily afforded me. I then asked him if there were any other alterations he desired to be made; and his reply was, that he should be satisfied with the omission alluded to, and which I made accordingly.

In regard to my having omitted to refer to his paper on the

change of type in fevers, let me state in explanation, that the observations in my lectures have reference to the question of change of type not in fevers only, but in acute diseases in general; and, if there be apparent similarity in our views in respect of the change of type as applied to fevers, let Dr. Murchison remember the long discussions we had on this point, and the possibility that he may have committed to paper joint views which he now charges me with borrowing.

And I may now observe, that Dr. Murchison can have no reasonable ground of complaint against me, inasmuch as his assistance in compiling the tables under my directions, and the deductions therefrom, were freely and voluntarily given; and that, as attending physician, my consent to making use of the hospital records by the junior assistant-physician might, according to custom, have been withheld; and that, moreover, he had ample opportunity, during the four years that have elapsed since my lectures were delivered at the College of Physicians, of having any fancied grievance rectified on my part; besides that I gave such an opportunity a few weeks before the appearance of my work, by putting the question direct to him. I can also affirm that, until his charge against me was publicly made in his preface, I had every reason to consider him not only a well-disposed colleague, but a personal friend. I must, therefore ascribe his conduct towards me on the present occasion to the most unworthy motives.

In conclusion, I wish to remark that my lectures do not profess to be a comprehensive treatise or compilation, but rather a practical commentary on an obscure class of diseases which have occupied my attention for more than forty years past. I have claimed nothing for myself but an earnest desire to be truthful; and if I have done any individual author injustice, or omitted to accord merit where it is due, I sincerely regret it; but be assured, Mr. Editor, that I am not a plagiarist. It is to me, I must add, a matter of surprise that, without due inquiry, you should have given circulation to such a calumny.

I have given a statement of facts, and shall not again trespass on your columns, but leave the matter at issue to the tribunal of the profession.

I am, etc., A. Tweedie.

17, Pall Mall, December 22nd, 1862.

[Dr. Tweedie informs us that the tables which he required for the illustration of his Lectures on Fever, delivered at the Royal College of Physicians in 1858, and a part of the notes appended to them, were handed to him for his use by Dr. Murchison *at least* a year before his lectures were delivered. The tables and the notes were the bases of the paper subsequently published by Dr. Murchison in the Medico-Chirurgical Society's *Transactions*. This paper was especially referred to in the comments which were made unfavourable to Dr. Tweedie in our last week's Journal. Dr. Tweedie, moreover, in the above letter, tells us that, some months ago, before

his Lectures were published as a separate volume, he asked Dr. Murchison "if there were any other alterations he desired to be made, and his reply was that he should be satisfied with the omission alluded to." In addition to this, we learn from Dr. Tweedie that, during the interval—nearly four years—which has elapsed between the delivery of Dr Tweedie's lectures at the College of Physicians, and their subsequent publication, Dr. Murchison has been on constant and intimate terms of communication with Dr. Tweedie, and has never made the slightest reclamation or objection to any statement made in Dr. Tweedie's lectures, beyond that referred to in Dr. Tweedie's letter. Under these circumstances, we feel bound to say that our reviewer would not have made the statements he has done had he been aware of the facts now stated by Dr. Tweedie. He took the case as it stood before him in the works of the two authors; and was certainly totally ignorant of the fact that Dr. Murchison had unreservedly placed his notes and tables in Dr. Tweedie's hands when Dr. Tweedie was preparing his lectures. We must add, however, that the reviewer was naturally led into error by the remark on the subject made in the preface of Dr. Murchison's work, and that it was under the misconception thus occasioned that he was led into making the charges, which were not warranted by the facts of the case. EDITOR.]

VI.

LETTER FROM DR. MURCHISON TO EDITOR OF "BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL," PUBLISHED JANUARY 3RD, 1863, WITH REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

Sir,—The letter from Dr. Tweedie in your last number, together with your comments thereon founded upon his statements, demands a reply from me. I have at the same time to express surprise, that you should have passed a judgment on the case, upon the assertions of one side only, notwithstanding the unbiassed opinion arrived at by your reviewer. I have important corrections to make on those assertions, which must lead your readers to a different conclusion.

1. It is not the fact that I drew up my statistical tables, either at the suggestion, or on the plan, or under the directions of Dr. Tweedie, nor that I undertook the work for his lectures. I had begun the analysis of the data contained in the records of the Fever Hospital, as an independent research, *months* before I heard or knew of Dr. Tweedie's intended lectures. Dr. Tweedie may know when he formed his decision; but he is not, and cannot be, a competent or credible witness as to when I formed my design, and began the execution of it. Dr. Tweedie asked me to ascertain for him the sexes and mean ages of one hundred cases of typhus and typhoid fever; and on my reminding him that I was already engaged in a much more extended inquiry, he expressed a wish to avail himself of the results for his lectures. The internal evidence

respectively of his work and mine will show that I had a higher aim, than that of being a mechanical drudge to Dr. Tweedie. The conception, plan, and execution of my tables were wholly and solely my own.

2. It is not the fact that Dr. Tweedie was in possession of my tables, "*at least* a year before his lectures were delivered," for the tables were brought down to December 31st, 1857; they were not even finished until February 1858, while Dr. Tweedie's first lecture, in which they were used, was given on March 12th, 1858.

3. It is not the fact that Dr. Tweedie was not informed of my intended paper to the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, until *after* he had received my tables. When they were handed to him, he was distinctly aware that they were only lent to him for his lectures, and that they were prepared to accompany that paper, which bears the record of having been received by the Society on March 30th, and read on April 27th, 1858. (*Med.-Chir. Trans.*, vol. xli, pp. 219-306.)

4. The appended notes, to which Dr. Tweedie refers, were brief memoranda, not exceeding two or three pages, explanatory of the object of the tables; while the paper under reference extended to eighty-eight pages of letter-press. Dr. Tweedie never saw the manuscript of this paper, which alone contains the passages where his language and mine is identical. I had the permission of the Hospital Committee, as well as the sanction of *both* the physicians, Dr. Tweedie and Dr. Southwood Smith, to make use of the records of the hospital for fever statistics; and I can prove by the testimony of a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians, that he had perused the complete manuscript of my essay *before* the delivery of Dr. Tweedie's first lecture, at which he was present.

5. Dr. Tweedie, in his published *Lectures* (page 198), actually cites, not MS. memoranda, but my *printed essay*, as the source whence he derived the information which, according to your reviewer, he has made use of in such a manner, as to lead to a wrong impression as to the shares contributed by him and me respectively. He refers to it repeatedly, and at one place observes: "I am bound to acknowledge, that for the statistical facts, I am indebted to the recently *published paper* of my colleague, Dr. Murchison, who, availing himself of the ample opportunities the Fever Hospital afforded, has produced a most valuable monograph on the mortality of the different forms of fever, and on the causes, which apparently influence their prevalence. (*Med.-Chir. Trans.*, vol. xli.)"*

6. It is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between the crude materials existing in the Registers of the Fever Hospital, and the conclusions which, by analysis, may be educed from them. No complaint has been made of Dr. Tweedie's having used my

---

* The first half of Dr. Tweedie's Lectures were delivered in March 1858, and the remainder in 1859; *but none of them were published* until 1860. My essay was published in December 1858.

tables; he had my permission to use them. But it is otherwise when he adopts my reasonings and views, in the *ipsissima verba* of my printed essay, in such a manner as to lead his readers to think, that my remarks are his own observations upon the facts collected by me. The very manner in which he introduces my name at certain places, is calculated to make the reader believe, that some of my remarks are his qualifications of views expressed by me. A comparison of page 202 of Dr. Tweedie's lectures with page 290 of my essay in the *Med.-Chir. Trans.*, is sufficient to show, that the notice in my preface was fully called for. It is unnecessary for me to enter into the details of the manner in which Dr. Tweedie has appropriated my writings, as this has been done by your reviewer, who, as you say, "took the case as it stood before him in the works of the two authors," unbiassed by either party, and whose statement of facts is in no way invalidated by your remarks. (See also *Med. Times and Gazette* of January 3rd, 1863.)

7. I have not been indebted to Dr. Tweedie for any facts obtained by him by correspondence with leading provincial physicians, as to the recent prevalence of fever. The leading physicians of Great Britain and Ireland well know how often I have troubled them, during the last six years, for information on this point; and indeed, Dr. Tweedie, in his *Lectures* (p. 200), admits that I had made a valuable addition to the statistics of the London Fever Hospital, by collecting those of provincial and other hospitals.

8. With reference to Dr. Tweedie's statement, that he had mentioned to me some months ago his intention of republishing his lectures, I beg to remind Dr. Tweedie that *it was I* who, in August, interrogated him whether the report to that effect was correct, adding, that if such was the case, I would require of him to alter the expression made use of in his lectures in the *Lancet*, that he had suggested my inquiries to me (*vide Lancet*, 1860, 1, 3); and that if he did not do so, I should be under the necessity of taking notice of the matter as an unwarranted assertion. Dr. Tweedie at once consented to omit the expression objected to, and did so; yet he now reiterates that it is strictly accurate. This I again emphatically deny. It is an erroneous, and apparently ineradicable, impression on Dr. Tweedie's mind, that what was lent to him for his use, was originated by him.

9. I have no recollection of Dr. Tweedie asking me if I desired him to make any other alterations; but even if he did so, I could not have stated the grounds of my present complaint. It was not until some weeks after the occasion alluded to, on finding how my words had been attributed to Dr. Tweedie, in one of the Cork Fever Hospital Reports, that I was induced, for the first time, to read Dr. Tweedie's lectures, so as to discover the free use which he had made of my writings without acknowledgment.

10. The preceding paragraphs have reference solely to my essay in the *Med.-Chir. Trans.*; and I beg to call the attention of your readers to the circumstance, that my preface contains no other

allusion to Dr. Tweedie in connection with that paper than the following:—"Most of the tables contained in the essay referred to, together with my remarks upon them, have been adopted by Dr. Tweedie in his Lumleian Lectures, published in the *Lancet* for 1860."

11. The only other reference to Dr. Tweedie in my preface is as follows: "Dr. Tweedie, being about to republish his lectures, I feel it due to myself further to state, that most of his facts and reasonings bearing on the question of 'change of type' of continued fevers will be found in a paper published by me in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August 1858. As Dr. Tweedie omits to mention my paper, I think it necessary to allude to the circumstance, lest it might appear that I had now borrowed some of my remarks from his lectures without acknowledgment." The paper here referred to had no connection with that published in the *Med.-Chir. Trans.;* and but few of the facts and reasonings contained in it were derived from the statistics of the London Fever Hospital. Dr. Tweedie's Lecture, treating on the subject in question, was not delivered before 1859;* and in the meantime, he received from me two copies of my paper, having mislaid one of them. I never had any conversation with Dr. Tweedie on the question of change of type in fever, except in reference to the published paper which I had given to him. Concerning this paper, your reviewer, who was guided solely by the documents before him, observes:—"The facts collected by him (Dr. Murchison), and a great part of the arguments derived from them (as given in a paper published in the *Edinburgh Monthly Journal* for August 1858), have been transferred by Dr. Tweedie to his lectures (pp. 214-217) without the least acknowledgment, and even in such a way as to lead to the impression that they are Dr. Tweedie's own." If this be the opinion of an unbiassed reader, it is obvious that the explanation in my preface was necessary for my own protection.

12. I have further to observe, in reference to the indignant tone of Dr. Tweedie's remarks, that although five weeks have elapsed since the publication of my work, Dr. Tweedie only now comes forward to express them publicly. On December 2nd, he deputed a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians to see me in reference to the statements in my preface concerning himself. That gentleman, after carefully investigating the whole of the documentary evidence, and hearing what Dr. Tweedie and I had to state, informed Dr. Tweedie by letter that, in his opinion, I should have been open to serious misconstruction if I had remained silent, and that the remarks in my Preface were justified by the facts of the case. Indeed, the referee's letter was so similar in its terms to those employed by your reviewer, that when the review appeared, the referee thought it necessary to communicate with Dr. Tweedie to disown its authorship. *I invite Dr. Tweedie to publish his own referee's letter.*

* See previous note, p. 20.

Lastly, I have to observe that the remarks in my Preface, which have led to this discussion, were made, not aggressively, but in self-defence, to protect myself from the imputation of having copied from Dr. Tweedie without acknowledgment. Entire sentences in Dr. Tweedie's published Lectures are couched in the identical words employed in my previously published essays; so that I was under the necessity of giving some explanation. If seniority in standing is to justify the appropriation of the labours of a junior, a new canon will have been introduced into the code of professional ethics. And, because I have acted in self-defence, Dr. Tweedie has so far forgotten himself as to attribute to me "the most unworthy motives". I need hardly add that I repudiate the imputation. Such language is unusual on the part of one Fellow of the College of Physicians towards another; while the imputation of motives in all such discussions is commonly regarded as the sign of a weak cause, or of a failing argument. Moreover, this remark has been elicited from Dr. Tweedie, not by my Preface, which he allowed to pass for weeks without any public notice, but by the review in your pages, with which I had no connection, whatever. I am, etc.

CHARLES MURCHISON.

79, Wimpole Street, W., December 29th, 1862.

[Dr. Murchison is under a misconception in supposing that, in the remarks made in our last number, we passed any judgment upon the case. What we did was this: we willingly accepted Dr. Tweedie's statement as explaining away the charge of plagiarism brought forward in the review. The charge of plagiarism, it must be remembered, was not made by Dr. Murchison himself in the Preface to his work on *Fevers;* but, as we said last week, the statement there made, after comparing the writings of the two authors, led our reviewer to make use of the expression in question. EDITOR.]

VII.

DR. TWEEDIE'S VERSION OF THE CASE, PUBLISHED IN THE "MEDICAL TIMES AND GAZETTE," DECEMBER 27TH, 1862.

Charge of Plagiarism against Dr. Tweedie.—We are informed, on the best authority, that the charge of plagiarism from Dr. Murchison, which was made against Dr. Tweedie in last week's number of the *British Medical Journal*, could only have been framed by a person who was unacquainted with the relative position of those gentlemen. We are assured that the materials which Dr. Tweedie is accused of appropriating without acknowledgment, were in reality drawn up by Dr. Murchison, at the request of Dr. Tweedie, in order to be employed by the latter gentleman in his Lectures at the College of Physicians. This was done at a time when the records of the Fever Hospital were at Dr. Tweedie's disposal, and when Dr. Murchison could not

have used them without his senior's leave. There is, therefore, no other plagiarism than is customary with every senior at the Bar or in Physic, who leaves it to his juniors to collect statistics, and write out the details of any given case. We are assured, further, that this very grave charge, thus made in the absence of correct information, found its way, by pure inadvertence, into the columns of the *British Medical Journal*, and that, till published, it had escaped the eye of the editor,* who has promised all the reparation due to the two gentlemen whose mutual position is compromised by this accident.

VIII.

LETTER FROM DR. MURCHISON TO THE EDITOR OF THE "MEDICAL TIMES AND GAZETTE," PUBLISHED JANUARY 3RD, 1863.

SIR,—I trust to your justice, to allow me to reply to a paragraph in the last number of your journal. You have either been greatly misled, or your information has been derived from one entirely ignorant of the facts. The materials to which you allude were not analysed by me for the purpose of illustrating Dr. Tweedie's Lectures, but were prepared expressly for the paper published by me in the *Med.-Chir. Transactions* (vol. xli). I had the permission of the Fever Hospital Committee, and the sanction of *both* the Physicians, Dr. Southwood Smith and Dr. Tweedie, for making this use of them. My investigations were commenced long before I knew that Dr. Tweedie was going to give any Lectures on "Fever"; the paper was presented to the Society on March 30, 1858; and it was finished and submitted to the perusal of professional friends several weeks before Dr. Tweedie gave his first Lecture on March 12, 1858, as I can prove by the testimony of a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians who attended Dr. Tweedie's Lectures. It is not the case that my investigations were made under Dr. Tweedie's directions, or that he suggested any plan whatever for conducting them. The fact is, that a portion of the tables drawn up by me with great labour, together with a few brief memoranda explaining their object, were lent by me to Dr. Tweedie, for the illustration of his Lectures, *but it was on the distinct understanding that they had been prepared for my memoir above referred to.* A comparison of our respective works is sufficient to show that I was not a mere mechanical drudge in the hands of Dr. Tweedie.

You err, however, in thinking that Dr. Tweedie has been accused of appropriating, without acknowledgment, the statistics of the Fever Hospital tabulated by me; for, in truth, at page 198 of his Lectures, he acknowledges that he is indebted for the tables in question to my paper in the *Med.-Chir. Transactions.* He

* The Editor of the *British Medical Journal* did not authorise either Dr. Tweedie, or the Editors of the *Medical Times and Gazette*, to make any such statement.—C. M.

observes:—"I am bound to acknowledge that for the statistical facts I am indebted *to the recently published paper* of my colleague, Dr. Murchison, who, availing himself of the ample opportunities the Fever Hospital afforded, has produced a most valuable monograph on the mortality of the different forms of fever, and on the causes which apparently influence their prevalence.—*Med.-Chir. Transactions*, vol. xli" (Dr. Tweedie's Lectures, p. 198).

The complaint is, that Dr. Tweedie has appropriated the conclusions to which I was led by my researches, and, in fact, the *ipsissima verba* of my published essays, in such a manner that, if I had not noticed the circumstance, I would have rendered myself liable to the imputation, that, in my recently-published work, I had borrowed some of my remarks from his lectures without acknowledgment. Several of the passages in question had no reference to the statistics of the Fever Hospital. The paragraph in my Preface, objected to by Dr. Tweedie, was referred *by him* nearly four weeks ago to a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians, who, after the closest inquiry, and hearing all that both parties had to say, informed Dr. Tweedie, by letter, that he considered my remarks justified, and that silence on my part would have laid me open to serious misconstruction.

That my remarks were called for you must admit, on perusing the paragraphs here appended in parallel columns.* They illustrate the use which has been made of my writings; they prove that Dr. Tweedie has been credited with having written a paragraph contained in my previously-published essay; and they show that the very way in which he has introduced my name is calculated to disconnect me from the authorship of the passage. Moreover, the numerical results here given, extending over forty years, and having no reference to the London Fever Hospital, were worked out by me specifically for the memoir referred to.

I shall not trouble you with further details, which will be found in a letter addressed by me to the *British Medical Journal*.

I am, etc.

CHARLES MURCHISON.

79, Wimpole Street, W., December 27th.

IX.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS IN "MEDICAL TIMES AND GAZETTE," JANUARY 3RD, 1863.

THE IMPUTED PLAGIARISM.

THE imputation of plagiarism, to which we referred in a note last week, has again been brought under our notice by a letter from Dr. Murchison, which we publish in another part of our columns. Dr. Murchison's "Researches on Fever" have given him a lasting claim on the consideration of the Medical Profession. Few men have sought or obtained larger opportunities of studying the continued

* The parallel columns are given at page 6.

fevers of our own and warmer climates, and we are bound to say that few men have made better use of their opportunities. He has observed fever in Bengal, in Burmah, Dublin, Paris, Edinburgh, and London; and has twice experienced, in his own person, the dire, but fortunately, in his case, not fatal, effects of the disease of his special adoption. We may further say, that the results which he has obtained are so important, that any work on "Fever" in which they were overlooked would be simply behind the present position of science. It was, therefore, with no surprise that we read the following passage in the preface to his comprehensive work just published:—"Many of the tables contained in the essay referred to (read before the Medical and Chirurgical Society in 1858), together with my remarks upon them, have been adopted by Dr. Tweedie, in his 'Lumleian Lectures,' published in the *Lancet* for 1860. Dr. Tweedie being about to republish his lectures, I feel it due to myself further to state, that most of his facts and reasonings, bearing on the question of the 'Change of Type of Continued fevers,' will be found in a paper published by me in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August, 1858." He, however, goes on to say—"As Dr. Tweedie omits to mention my paper, I think it necessary to allude to the circumstance, lest it might appear that I had now borrowed some of my remarks from his lectures without acknowledgment." The information we received last week led us to suppose that the tables drawn up by Dr. Murchison were compiled at the request of Dr. Tweedie from the records of the Fever Hospital, in order to be used in his lectures before the College of Physicians, and that, therefore, the tables, and the deductions from them, were fairly common property, or, at least, might be ceded by a junior to a senior Physician without the slightest imputation. Dr. Murchison's letter gives a different complexion to the affair. We confess we are unable to understand how the results at which Dr. Murchison had arrived from a study of the statistics of the Irish Hospitals could be claimed by Dr. Tweedie, and the same remark applies to the facts and reasonings on the "Change of Type of Continued Fevers," published in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal*. If Dr. Tweedie (than whom, as an energetic and accomplished worker in the same field as Dr. Murchison, no man deserves more Professional respect) will throw some further light on the subject, we shall gladly receive it. In the meanwhile, we trust that a misunderstanding, which is detrimental to the interests of Medical science and Professional honour, will not be allowed to continue. Plagiarism is a harsh term. We have said that Dr. Tweedie could not, in justice to his hearers and readers, do otherwise than quote Dr. Murchison; and he has more than once referred to Dr. Murchison by name in connection with the passages in question. It would have been better had he more carefully and clearly ascribed to their source the paragraphs which he quoted; but the character and position of the author of the Lumleian Lectures, and his connection with Dr. Murchison as a colleague, forbid us to suppose this any-

thing worse than an inadvertent omission. The very nature of scientific observations forbid their being clothed in a variety of diction; and it is a thousand times better to quote *verbatim* an original writer on matters of science than to obscure or weaken his meaning by translation. In fact, even out of pure science, by far the larger amount of literary labour consists in pouring, either knowingly or unknowingly, from one vessel into another. We regret that this matter was not allowed to remain where Dr. Murchison left it in his preface. He there had fully and sufficiently vindicated his claim to his own property. But it will be observed that he there does not accuse Dr. Tweedie of plagiarism; and we have undoubted authority for asserting that Dr. Murchison has had nothing whatever to do with any review of his book that has appeared since its publication. What would be the effect on the library of the College of Surgeons if all the Medical, scientific and philosophical works in it were, by some benevolent fairy, reduced to the dimensions of the original observations, facts, and reasonings of their respective authors? Eight-tenths would vanish at once, and the transformation of the remainder would be startling as the Miltonic miracle—

> "They, but now who seem'd
> In bigness to surpass earth's giant sons,
> Now, less than smallest dwarfs, in narrow room
> Throng numberless."

X.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS IN THE "LANCET," JANUARY 3RD, 1863.

THE FEVER CONTROVERSY.

A SOMEWHAT unpleasant and unedifying controversy has arisen between the two leading authorities on the subject of fever in this country. The questions at issue between Dr. Tweedie and Dr. Murchison are not purely scientific, but trench, in a great measure, on the ground of literary and professional morality. Both of these physicians have recently published works on fever, of which that of Dr. Tweedie anticipated that of Dr. Murchison's by a few weeks in its issue from the press. While the proofs of Dr. Murchison's work were being read by a professional friend, it was observed that in many passages, some of considerable length, not only the general argument, but the diction was identical with passages in Dr. Tweedie's book, these not being distinguished by quotation marks in either, but appearing in each as the original observations and deductions of the respective authors. This was pointed out to Dr. Murchison, and he referred back to his previous printed papers in the *Edinburgh Monthly Medical Journal* and "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions," where these passages are to be found printed as parts of isolated papers which he has published from time to time, containing the result of original investigation. He felt it necessary, therefore, to introduce into his preface a passage, claiming for

himself their authorship, and protecting himself from the apparent fault of unavowed plagiarism. This has attracted attention, and has produced a literary *bévue* of errors and improprieties, in which some of our medical contemporaries have distinguished themselves by more than ordinary incapacity and rashness. The unhappy organ of the British Medical Association seized eagerly the opportunity of distinguishing itself by a terrific onslaught on Dr. Tweedie. Of course that experienced physician had explanations to offer, and next week the fierce attack was followed by an abject apology. If possible the apology was more dangerous than the attack, for it is more full of errors, and this week the *Journal* must again eat humble pie. An amusing incident simultaneously complicated the question. The "management" of another periodical, learning that Dr. Tweedie had to complain of a review in its contemporary, addresses Dr. Murchison with a letter, asking for a communication on the subject, and expressing the intention of intervening in the question, and leaving the honour of both parties intact. It follows up the intention by announcing that it has learned "on the best authority" that the editor of its contemporary had never seen the long review which was inserted in the journal he is supposed to edit, and giving its own version of the affair, which is also in the highest degree inaccurate. It is not to be expected that the editor of the *Journal* will confirm the former statement, as to his omission to edit his journal, although made on the best authority, and the mutual confusion, the apologies and recriminations, make up as pretty a burlesque as could be presented by actors who are well accustomed to play a part in a "Comedy of Errors."

The substantial merits of the question are quite obscured in this *bévue* by the errors, apologies, recantations, and recriminations of those who have undertaken to arbitrate. Dr. Tweedie, on his side, avers that he has only made a perfectly justifiable use of certain MSS. voluntarily prepared by Dr. Murchison for his use, and at his suggestion, for the Lumleian Lectures delivered at the Royal College of Physicians by Dr. Tweedie, and rewritten by him for The Lancet. (See vol. i., 1860.) This position Dr. Murchison very strongly controverts, and as the question has now become one of etiquette, and even of literary morality, it is obviously desirable that it should not remain open, or be long and eagerly discussed, without an authoritative decision. Such a question may be most properly referred to arbitration. It has already been privately decided in favour of Dr. Murchison by a physician deputed by Dr. Tweedie to examine the question; but as Dr. Tweedie is far from acquiescing in that decision, it may most properly be referred for formal judgment to the Board of Censors of the College of Physicians. A good deal of evidence has been laid before us on both sides, but we decline to enter into the quarrel, or to express an opinion as to which of the two physicians is in error, if either. We trust that an official arbitration will offer a satisfactory solution of the difference.

XI.

LETTER FROM DR. MURCHISON TO THE EDITOR OF THE "LANCET," PUBLISHED JANUARY 3RD, 1863.

SIR,—In reference to certain remarks in two of your contemporaries on the recent works on Fever by Dr. Tweedie and myself respectively, permit me to state that I have deemed it due to myself to call the attention of the President and Censors' Board of the Royal College of Physicians to the exceptionable terms in which Dr. Tweedie has thought fit to attribute motives to me, and to submit the whole matter to the consideration of the Board.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES MURCHISON.

Wimpole-street, Dec. 1862.

XII.

DR. MURCHISON'S FIRST LETTER TO THE REGISTRAR OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

SIR,—I have to request that you will lay the subject of this communication before the President and Censors' Board.

In a letter published in the *British Medical Journal* of the 27th December, in reply to strictures contained in a review of the works which have recently appeared on Fever, by Dr. Tweedie and myself respectively, Dr. Tweedie has thought proper to attribute to me "the most unworthy motives," in consequence of certain remarks in my Preface. The following extract gives the passage in question:—

"I can also affirm that until his (Dr. Murchison's) charge against me was publicly made in his Preface, I had every reason to consider him not only a well-disposed colleague, but a personal friend. I must, therefore, ascribe his conduct towards me on the present occasion, to the most unworthy motives."

The passage in my Preface referred to is as follows:—

"Many of the tables contained in the essay referred to (*Med.-Chir. Trans.* vol. xli), together with my remarks upon them, have been adopted by Dr. Tweedie in his Lumleian Lectures, published in the *Lancet* for 1860. Dr. Tweedie being about to republish his Lectures, I feel it due to myself further to state, that most of his facts and reasonings bearing on the question of 'change of type' of continued fevers will be found in a paper published by me in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August 1858. As Dr. Tweedie omits to mention my paper, I think it necessary to allude to the circumstance, lest it might appear that I had now borrowed some of my remarks from his Lectures without acknowledgment."

These observations I felt it necessary to make after the most careful consideration of the circumstances. They were made, not aggressively, but in self-defence.

Soon after the appearance of my work, Dr. Tweedie, on the 2nd

of December, deputed a Fellow of the College to see me and remonstrate on what I had done. That gentleman, after most carefully reading and comparing the documents put into his hands, and hearing all that both parties had to say, informed Dr Tweedie, by letter, that my remarks appeared justified, and that silence on my part would have laid me open to serious misconstruction.

On the 20th of December, the review appeared in the *British Medical Journal*, in which the identity between certain passages in Dr. Tweedie's work and in my previously published essays was pointed out. In reply, Dr. Tweedie addressed a letter to the editor of the *Journal*, which, in addition to unwarrantable assertions, contains the imputation already referred to.

The expressions made use of by Dr. Tweedie, are, in my opinion, unprofessional, and unbecoming a Fellow of the College to apply to another Fellow; they convey an offensive and intolerable imputation; and I feel that it is due alike to my sense of self-respect and to the Royal College of Physicians, to which we both belong, that they should not be allowed to pass without adequate notice.

The means of an amicable settlement have been exhausted by the appeal made to the referee above mentioned; and I have, therefore, to request that you will submit the case to the President and Censors' Board, in order that they may call on Dr. Tweedie to substantiate or retract his imputation, and that they will investigate, if they think fit, the facts upon which the remarks in my preface, and the counter-assertions by Dr. Tweedie, are founded, with a view to such redress as the case may, by the decision of the Board, be entitled to.

I am your obedient servant,

CHARLES MURCHISON.

79, Wimpole Street, Dec. 31st, 1862.

XIII.—LETTER FROM DR. MURCHISON TO DR. TWEEDIE.

79, Wimpole Street, Jan. 1st, 1863.

Dr. Murchison presents his compliments to Dr. Tweedie, and begs to inform Dr. Tweedie that, with reference to the offensive remarks contained in Dr. Tweedie's letter to the *British Medical Journal*, imputing the "most unworthy motives" to Dr. Murchison, the latter has felt himself under the painful necessity of submitting the case to the President and Board of Censors of the College of Physicians, in order to justify himself before the profession, and to give Dr. Tweedie an opportunity of substantiating or retracting his allegation.

No reply was returned by Dr. Tweedie; but the following resolution of the Censors' Board was forwarded to Dr. Murchison by the Registrar of the College of Physicians.

XIV.—FIRST RESOLUTION OF CENSORS' BOARD.

(COPY.)

Meeting of the Censors' Board, Jan. 6th, 1863.

Resolved,—"That the Censors' Board having considered Dr. Murchison's letter of the 31st December, and having also ascertained that the subject-matter of that letter has been already laid fully before the public by Dr. Murchison, before time had been allowed for submitting the said letter to the Board, the Board is of opinion that it is unnecessary to interfere in the matter."

HENRY A. PITMAN, *Registrar.*

XV.

DR. MURCHISON'S SECOND LETTER TO THE REGISTRAR OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 6th instant, conveying copy of the resolution passed by the Censors' Board upon my appeal, to the effect that, as I had replied publicly to Dr. Tweedie's letter through the medical press, it was unnecessary for them to interfere.

2. With reference to their decision, I have to remark that it was not the literary question at issue between Dr. Tweedie and me which was submitted for their official interference, but the unwarrantable and unprofessional language applied unprovokedly by Dr. Tweedie to me . . . . I beg respectfully to insist that my remarks in reply to Dr. Tweedie on this head contained nothing that barred my right to appeal for redress to the Censors' Board; they were strictly guarded, and expressed nothing beyond a temperate repudiation of the imputation. I stated at the same time that I had considered it necessary, to bring that part of the case before the Censors' Board.

3. As regards the grounds on which the Board has considered it unnecessary to interfere, I submit that I could not, with justice to my professional honour, have let an hour pass without rebutting the injurious, disparaging, and unfounded assertions made respecting me by Dr. Tweedie. It was imperative that they should be instantly confronted, and I alone was competent to confute them. That part of the case I leave to the decision of the profession; but I beg that the Censors' Board will reconsider their decision in reference to the redress for the imputation of "the most unworthy motives," to which I think that I am entitled as a Fellow of the College. I respectfully submit that, if such language be allowed to pass with impunity, the "honour of the College" and the "high standard of morality" which every Fellow is bound and exhorted to maintain at his admission will be greatly imperilled.

I have the honour to remain your obedient servant,

CHARLES MURCHISON.

79, Wimpole Street, W., Jan. 10th, 1863.

XVI.—DR. MURCHISON'S THIRD LETTER TO THE REGISTRAR OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

Finding that Dr. Tweedie was distributing a reprint of his letter in the *British Medical Journal* for Dec. 27th, Dr. Murchison addressed a third letter to the Registrar of the College of Physicians as follows:—

To the Registrar of the Royal College of Physicians.

SIR,—With reference to my letter of the 10th inst., and the appeal therein submitted to the Censors' Board, I beg leave to forward copy of a printed document which Dr. Tweedie is *now* engaged in distributing.

2. The document in question is a *verbatim* reproduction of the letter dated Dec. 22nd, published by Dr. Tweedie in the *British Medical Journal* for Dec. 27th; and it repeats the unwarrantable and unprofessional language, imputing "the most unworthy motives" to me, respecting which I have appealed to the Censors' Board for redress.

3. I have now to remark, that the heat and irritation of the moment, arising from the charge of plagiarism *made by his reviewer*, might have been pleaded in excuse or in extenuation of Dr. Tweedie's conduct in the first instance, in falling foul of me as a vicarious sacrifice to his emotions; but the document herewith submitted shows the deliberate *animus* of Dr. Tweedie to uphold his calumnious imputation.

4. The Board will further observe, that the document in question is significantly silent regarding the *documentary evidence* which I produced in refutation of Dr. Tweedie's asseverations, in the letters published by me in the *Medical Times and Gazette*, and in the *British Medical Journal*, for Jan. 3rd, and which Dr. Tweedie has hitherto shrunk from publicly confronting.

5. I submit that the current circulation and utterance of this document by Dr. Tweedie furnishes additional grounds for my appeal being entertained by the Censors' Board. It is for them to determine whether such conduct be professional and honourable.

6. The enclosed document was given by Dr. Tweedie to a friend so recently as yesterday. I have to request that it be returned to me after it has been submitted to the Censors' Board.—I have the honour to remain your obedient servant,

CHARLES MURCHISON.

79, Wimpole Street, W., 17th, 1863.

A few days after the receipt of this letter, Dr. Tweedie and Dr. Murchison were summoned to appear before the Censors' Board on Saturday, Jan. 24th, in consequence of Dr. Murchison's complaint against Dr. Tweedie "for the use of unwarrantable and unprofessional language." The Board met, and, without seeing either Dr. Tweedie or Dr. Murchison, passed the following resolution.

XVII.—FINAL RESOLUTION OF CENSORS' BOARD.

"The Censors' Board having considered Dr. Murchison's second letter, see no reason for altering the resolution adopted at their last meeting. The imputation of unworthy motives does not appear to the Board to involve any question of medical ethics as distinct from general ethics, nor to fall within the category of those matters, the consideration of which is the special province of the Censors' Board."

XVIII.

LEADING ARTICLE IN THE "LANCET," JANUARY 31ST, 1863.

THE correspondence which has been handed to us for publication (see p. 125),* referring to the matters in dispute between Dr. MURCHISON and Dr. TWEEDIE, leaves for judgment by the profession at large a question of importance. The Board of Censors of the College of Physicians having declined to undertake the duty which was imposed upon them, of instituting a decorous and judicial inquiry into the different statements of the eminent physicians, Fellows of their College, who respectively lay one upon the other serious charges in regard to their medical writings, it is left to the profession to form its own judgment. Each of these two physicians has put forth certain statements, which they have printed separately, and are circulating among their friends.

It is necessary to recapitulate the main facts as they appear from the printed evidence thus recorded. They are not very complicated or difficult to understand.

The *casus belli* is a paragraph in the preface to Dr. MURCHISON'S "Treatise on Continued Fevers," to the effect that Dr. TWEEDIE had adopted the tables, and remarks upon them, from Dr. MURCHISON'S essay in the 41st volume of the "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions;" and also that the facts and reasonings on the question of Change of Type in Fever, given by Dr. TWEEDIE, were to be found in a paper published by Dr. MURCHISON in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal* for August, 1858. The parallel passages which Dr. MURCHISON points out as running through page after page of Dr. TWEEDIE'S work, include appropriation of elaborate reasonings and views and *ipsissima verba* throughout long sentences and paragraphs. There is no doubt of the identity of several parts of the two works, and especially of the more original matter in them.

This is evident and incontrovertible. The question at issue then becomes twofold—Who is the plagiarist, and is the plagiarism justifiable? Dr. MURCHISON charges Dr. TWEEDIE, in his book, with the "adoption" of his tables and remarks, and again with the "inadvertent transcription of his remarks," the effect of the latter being that in one instance a recent writer had quoted as from Dr.

---

* Pp. 29-32 of this pamphlet.

Tweedie a paragraph which appeared in Dr. Murchison's essay in 1858, and was "inadvertently transcribed" by Dr. Tweedie in a manner which had misled Dr. Pickells, the third writer in question.* The language employed by Dr. Murchison is sufficiently moderate; but no doubt the imputation was unpleasant. Dr. Tweedie therefore deputed Dr. A. P. Stewart, of the Middlesex Hospital, as a mutual friend, to act between himself and Dr. Murchison, and examine the matter. From Dr. Stewart's letter, now printed, and which lies before us, it appears that he informed Dr. Tweedie, in a very able, very temperate, and very gentlemanly letter, that Dr. Murchison could not, in fairness to himself, say less than he had said, and that "if he had kept silence he would have laid himself open to serious misconstruction.' We entirely concur with Dr. Stewart.

Subsequently this matter attracted more attention. A review was published in a medical periodical, and appeared, it is stated, without having been read by somebody who is supposed to edit the journal, and who seems to have given two opposite opinions, then to have denied that he ever gave any, and to have wound up by abusing other people for not giving one. Dr. Tweedie was roused into an active stage of indignation. He has printed a statement in reference to the question, and we sincerely wish that it were of a more satisfactory nature. Dr. Tweedie states that the tables, which appear both in his book and in that of Dr. Murchison, were prepared by the latter gentleman for the Lectures at the College of Physicians; that he had suggested the inquiry to Dr. Murchison; and that as physician he had a right to the statistics of the Fever Hospital. The similarity between his remarks and Dr. Murchison's he accounts for by certain manuscript notes, which he says were given him by that gentleman with the tables. He adds that Dr. Murchison's paper was not read until at least two months after the delivery of his lectures; and in reference to the paper on Change of Type, he accuses its author of committing to paper views which had been expressed by himself in conversation; and concludes by imputing "nnworthy motives."

To all this very absorbent reasoning Dr. Murchison furnishes the telling reply of inexorable facts. The investigations embodied in his paper in the "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions" were undertaken not at Dr. Tweedie's suggestion, but months before that physician had expressed any intention of lecturing on the subject. He lent to Dr. Tweedie the tables which he had prepared for his own essay, and makes no complaint of his adopting them. The passages which Dr. Tweedie has transcribed were *not* contained in the few manuscript memoranda (mainly explanatory of the tables) which were handed to him, but are appropriated from the paper in the "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions." Dr. Murchi-

* See Medico Chirurgical Transactions, vol. xli., p. 290, March 30th, 1858; *The Lancet*, 1860, vol. i, p. 486; Lectures on Fevers, 1862, p. 202; and Cork Fever Hospital Reports, Feb. 21st, 1861.

son's paper containing the remarks on Change of Type was published in August 1858; Dr. Tweedie's lecture containing the remarks on this subject was not delivered until 1859; and Dr. Murchison denies that he ever had any conversation with Dr. Tweedie on the subject, except in reference to the published paper which he had given to Dr. Tweedie.

It is hard to overcome the evidence of dates and printed documents. This is all against Dr. Tweedie. Dr. Murchison has the most distinct priority throughout; he could not do less than protect himself from the imputation of wholesale appropriation which necessarily falls upon one or the other. Dr. Tweedie, in fact, admits this priority when he talks of having a right to use freely labours undertaken for him. Certainly such labours may with impunity be used freely, and even ungenerously, to the extent that they are so undertaken voluntarily for another; but we cannot admit the right to push this principle—*sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes*—so far as to justify the appropriation of labours not so undertaken. Dr. Tweedie never saw the manuscript of the sentences which he transcribes, and for which he obtains credit in the reports of the Cork Fever Hospital; and if he freely used the manuscript notes which Dr. Murchison lent him, he was the more bound openly to acknowlege the quotation of words, facts, and figures, from Dr. Murchison's published paper, which certainly was not written for the sole purpose of redounding to Dr. Tweedie's advantage. *Noblesse oblige*; and the seniority of position which Dr. Tweedie so justly claims should have bound him to the more scrupulous observance of the respect due to the character and attainments of a younger man. It makes a bad cause worse, that Dr. Tweedie should wind up a wholly insufficient justification by imputing to his opponent "unworthy motives" for making statements palpably true—statements which he has not refuted, which were moderately and even considerately worded, and which his own referee, Dr. A. P. Stewart, had previously stamped with his approbation as necessary and carefully considered. That verdict of Dr. Stewart was a just and fair one: Dr. Tweedie would have done well to have abided by it. As it is, he has placed the profession under the necessity of giving a judgment: upon the evidence that judgment must be registered in favour of Dr. Murchison.

Dr. Tweedie has made no reply to the above article, nor to any of Dr. Murchison's letters.

February 27th, 1863.

ST THOMAS'S HO
15 JAN 19
MEDICAL SCHOOL

ST. THOMAS' HOSPITAL
15 JA 30
MEDICAL SCHOOL LIBRARY